



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/694,879

10/29/2003

Martin Zilliacus

27592-00449-US

4091

30678

7590

04/27/2009

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 EYE STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1100

WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

HOLLIDAY, JAIME MICHELE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/694,879</p>	<p>Applicant(s) ZILLIACUS ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner JAIME M. HOLLIDAY</p>	<p>Art Unit 2617</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 7-14, 17-21, 40-47 and 57-61.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: _____.

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Applicants basically argue that the prior art of record, in particular, the combination of Heinonen et al., Hasty, Jr. et al. and Norefors et al., does not teach or suggest "the code and the wide area identification are to be coupled into a hashed code for proximity identification of the mobile device, and wherein the hashed code is to be transmitted to the mobile device along with an instruction to forward the hashed code to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device." Further, Applicants argue that there is no teaching or suggestion in Hasty that the hashed MAC address and IP address are for proximity identification of the mobile device, as alleged in the Office Action, but instead, Hasty only discloses that the local ad-hoc table with the hashed IP and MAC addresses are used to answer intercepted ARP and DHCP requests at the node. Applicants also argue that Norefors does not teach or suggest that the hashed code is forwarded "to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device," and there is no teaching or suggestion in Norefors of associating the content of the hash code (the code and the wide area identification) in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device. Examiner respectfully disagrees, because Hasty, Jr. et al. teaches that the MAC address (wide area identification) and class B address (code) are hashed. The Class B address designates the type, location of a node and the network subdivision, which refers to the location/position (proximity) of the node (col. 6 lines 5-15). The combination of Heinonen et al. and Hasty, Jr. et al. does not teach forwarding this hashed code, and the Norefors reference is incorporated to teach this limitation. The claim does not recite what entity receives the request for subsequent service. The handover request to the second access point in Norefors et al. reads on the claimed "subsequent service." Norefors et al. further teach the mobile terminal receiving a message with a hash code and forwarding that message to the second access point for the handover, reading on the claimed "wherein the hashed code is to be transmitted to the mobile device along with an instruction to forward the hashed code to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device." Therefore, in view of the preceding arguments, Examiner maintains the previous rejections.